

THE
PARALLEL:
OR, A
VINDICATION
OF HIS

Gr——e the A——b——p of C——t——y,
For his Opposing the PROMOTION of ——— K
Dr. S———l C———k
To a BISHOPRICK.

Occasion'd by a Late PAMPHLET, Intitled,
*The Reasons alledged against Dr. R——'s
Promotion to the See of G———r,*
Seriously and Dispassionately considered.
With some REMARKS thereon.

In a LETTER to a FRIEND.

By a Gentleman of the University of Cambridge.

*Legum idcirco omnes Servi sumus, ut liberi esse
possimus. Cic. in Cluent.*

*Custode Rerum Cesare, non Furor
Civilis, aut Vis exigit Otium:
Non Ira, quæ procudit Enses,
Et miseras inimicat Urbes. Hor.*

L O N D O N:
Printed for JAMES ROBERTS in *Warwick Lane.*
MDCCXXXV. Price 1 s.



P

I

bo
we
rec
wil
a n

gre
ner
ken
def
the
ven
thin
Per
he
atm
of
Op

T H E
P A R A L L E L.

S I R,

I May seem to want some Apology for troubling you with the present Vindication, in answer to the Letter you sent me, which I had heard much talked of, and had then born a second Impression : But as all the Returns we can make for the Favours and Protection we receive, is only the Tribute of the Pen, That I willingly pay ; tho', in this Case, I wish it was in a much abler Hand.

I must own I was extremely *surprized* to find so great a Man in the Church treated in such a manner ; to see the Art, the Pains that has been taken to render him odious, under the Pretence of defending another ; whereas it may appear, from the Characters the Author of that Letter has given, that his Intention was only to introduce something which is to follow ; that his Aim is not at Persons only, but there are Designs in view which he vainly hopes to promote, by sowing Discord amongst the Great, and by lessening the Credit of one from whom he may expect the greatest Opposition.

The Reflections made by him you will find are not singular, but against all who are of the same Church of *England* Principles : I thought it therefore not improper, to take it in the present View ; for tho' his G——ce be not once mentioned, and possibly not intended to have been reflected on in particular, yet his Arguments, *if they have any Weight or Influence*, tho' principally levelled at another, must, in the Consequence, hurt his G——ce's Character, whose pious Labours, and steady Adherence, to the Principles and Doctrine of the Church of *England*, in the most dangerous Times ; whose hearty Zeal for the Protestant Succession in the present Royal Family, his tender Compassion for scrupulous Consciences, and universal Benevolence towards all Mankind, with an Abhorrence of Persecution upon Account of Religion ; made him worthy of, and raised him to that high Post which he has filled with so much Honour ; and yet, who without the least Diminution of his great Character, or hurting the Cause of Liberty, as a faithful Counsellor to his Sovereign, a diligent Pastor of his Church, a Friend to the Peace and Quiet of the Kingdom, gave a strenuous Opposition to the Promotion of Dr. S——l C——k to a Bishoprick, by reason that he was suspected of some unhappy Errors in Points of Religion, inconsistent with the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, and the true Faith of a Christian ; notwithstanding that his great Learning and Probity, his pious Example, his Labours in support of Religion in general against Atheism and Infidelity, had gained him the Friendship, and even the Recommendation of many of high Rank.

It is asserted, that the present Opposition to Dr. R——, arose from the Principles of that great Man, whose Opinion (especially since the Age and Infirmities of our Metropolitan had with-

withdrawn him from the Publick) concerning the Fitness of Persons for spiritual Preferments, has been frequently required by his Majesty. Where Persons act alike, we may presume that they act upon the same Principles; it will not therefore be foreign to my present Purpose to observe, that these Principles of Church Power and Church Government, were not thought unworthy the Patronage of Archbishop *Tenison*, whose Memory will ever be blessed amongst all those who are true Friends to our Constitution, to whom that Work which is now censured, was dedicated. And I doubt not but it will appear, that this learned Prelate has *always acted a very consistent Part*; a Part suitable to his great Character, equal to the Example his great Patron set him, in his Zeal for Religion, his steady Adherence to our Constitution both in Church and State, together with all those shining Virtues that compose a faithful Subject, a great and good Man.

Neither do I think that the Friends of Dr. R— will look upon him to be injured by the *Parallel*, which, if it should be applied to him, ranks him with one whom the learned World had in so high an Esteem; who was valued and loved by the Good and Great, tho' pitied for some unhappy Errors he had imbibed, or which the too great Reliance on his metaphysical way of Reasoning had carried him into: Unhappy to think, with the short Line of Reason, to fathom the Depths of Eternity, or to comprehend the Essence of the Godhead, which both Faith and Reason tells us is incomprehensible.

I wish the Author of that Letter had as seriously and dispassionately considered the Case before him, he would not then have so injuriously put together those Extracts from the Writings of that learned Prelate, only to raise an Odium from un-
con-

connected and dispersed Sentences; he would not only have made use of *his Words*, but would have mentioned their Connection with those Passages from whence they were taken; he would not have endeavoured to give his Readers a different Idea of their *Extent and Consequence*, than they would have conceived from the Book itself if it had lain before them.

What *Power* has this Right Reverend Prelate ever aimed at, but the Power of doing good, the Power of punishing Vice and Immorality, of maintaining God's Worship? Let the most spiteful and prying Eye search into all his Acts of Jurisdiction, and see if they can find one Instance where a tender Conscience has been oppressed by him. No! these are not his Arts of gaining Profelytes to the Truth, to *compel them to come in*: He uses no Force but the Strength of Reason and Scripture, and strives to remove their Prejudices by Humanity and Forbearance.

If "the Tone of the Voice, the Motion of a Hand, the Gesture of the Body, do frequently determine the Signification of Words," as the Author of the Letter observes, How much more does the Connection of one Sentence with another, with the Argument for which it is used, the Application to which it is made, determine the Meaning and Extent of it? I shall therefore first consider the several Passages extracted from the Preface to that * learned and laborious Work, from which, tho' designed for the Use of the Clergy only, the Professors both of the Common and Canon Laws have received great Assistance; and, upon Inquiry, I persuade myself that you will find they cannot, ought not, to give Offence.

* Cod. Juris Ecclesiastici Anglicani.

After the learned Author has declared, that it was attempted purely for the Service of the Clergy, “ † he recommends it to such Persons in “ the Universities, as are designed for holy Orders ; that when they are promoted to Benefices, they may not be Strangers to the Rights which the Law gives, nor to the Duties which it requires ; and (if they be vested with Jurisdiction of any kind) they may be able with ordinary Application, to be their own Judges in all Points that relate to the Correction of Manners ; and in such other Matters as concern *Order and Discipline* in the Church : The vigorous Administration of which is, *he says*, “ one of the greatest Supports to Religion, and “ to the Honour of God’s publick Worship. “ And as such is the proper Province of the Ordinaries themselves.”

But it is asked “ what he calls Order and Discipline.” Is not that the Language of the Laws, of the Articles, of the Canons, of the Liturgy of the Church of *England*? And are they Terms improper for an ecclesiastical Ordinary to use? Or does he call any thing Order and Discipline which the Laws of the Church, allowed by the Laws of the Land, do not call so? Take his own Words: “ Our * present Rule of Government and Discipline in the Church, are the “ Laws in being.”

Is not that *Vigorous Administration* of Justice in temporal Matters, which we with so much Pleasure observe in the Sages of the Law, who preside in the temporal Courts, one of the greatest Supports of the Government, and to the Honour of his Majesty’s Administration?

† Preface, p. 8, 9.

* Page 31.

tion? Which tho' it shines with Lustre in every Part, does in none more, than in that happy and wise Choice he makes of those who exercise his Authority therein: Men of that extensive Knowledge, deep Judgment, sound Learning, great Patience, and unbiass'd Integrity: Why then is the ecclesiastical Ordinary to be censured, for asserting, that in such Matters as concern the *Order and Discipline* of the Church, the *vigorous Administration* thereof, is one of the greatest Supports to Religion, and is to the Honour of God's publick Worship.

The great Oracle of the Law, as he is stiled, the Lord *Coke*, gives this Account of the temporal and ecclesiastical Laws *. “ The Kingdom of
 “ *England* is an absolute Empire and Monarchy,
 “ consisting of one Head, which is the King,
 “ and of a Body Politick, compact and com-
 “ pounded of many, and almost infinite, several,
 “ and yet well agreeing Members; all which the
 “ Law divideth into two Parts, the Clergy, and
 “ the Laity, both of them, next and immediately
 “ under God, subject and obedient to the Head:
 “ Also the kingly Head of this politick Body,
 “ is instituted and furnished with plenary Prero-
 “ gative and Jurisdiction, to render Justice and
 “ Right to every Part and Member of this Body.
 “ And as in temporal Causes, the King by the
 “ Mouth of his Judges, in his Courts of Justice,
 “ doth judge and determine the same, by the
 “ temporal Laws of *England*; so in Causes Ec-
 “ clesiastical and Spiritual, as namely, Blasphemy,
 “ Apostasy from Christianity, *Heresies*, Schisms,
 “ Ordering, Admissions, Institutions of Clerks,
 “ Celebration of Divine Service—Right of
 “ Tythes, Oblations, Obventions, Dilapidations,

* 5 Rep. Caudry's Case.

“ Reparation of Churches—Simony, Incest,
 “ Fornication, Adulteries—and others (*the Co-*
 “ *nusance whereof belongs not to the Common Laws*
 “ *of England*) The same are to be determined
 “ and decided by ecclesiastical Judges, according
 “ to the King’s ecclesiastical Laws of this Realm.
 “ —For, albeit the Kings of *England* derived
 “ their ecclesiastical Laws from others, yet so
 “ many as were proved, approved and allowed
 “ here, by and with a general Consent, are aptly
 “ and rightly called *the King’s ecclesiastical Laws*,
 “ which whosoever shall deny, he denieth that
 “ the King hath full and plenary Power to de-
 “ liver Justice in all Causes, and to punish all
 “ Crimes and Offences within his Kingdom: For
 “ that, as before, it appeareth, the deciding of
 “ Matters of so many and so great Importance
 “ *are not within the Consusance of the Common*
 “ *Laws*, and consequently that the King is no
 “ compleat Monarch, nor Head of the whole
 “ and entire Body of the Realm.”

What then does *our great Ecclesiastic*, as the
 Author stiles him, advance, but what is supported
 by *our Great Common Lawyer*? the one says that
 the due Administration of the Laws which relate
 to *Order and Discipline* in the Church, is one of
 the greatest Supports to Religion, and to the Ho-
 nour of God’s Worship, and is the proper Business
 of the Ordinary; the other infers, that the Denial
 thereof is, in Consequence, to deny that the King
 is the complete Head of the whole and entire
 Body of the Realm: For *Order and Discipline* are
 only the King’s ecclesiastical Laws, which re-
 late to the Government of the Church, and the
 due Performance of divine Offices, and Punish-
 ment of those Offences, wherein the King deli-
 vers Justice by the Hands of the ecclesiastical
 Judges, that is, the Proper Ordinaries. Happy

is it then for this Church, that under his Majesty,
 “ all his *Views, all his Advices, all his Measures*
 “ *will be directed to so good an End.*”

Another Passage in this Preface, wherein he is misrepresented, is where the Letter says, “ The
 “ Power of the Church is his great Aim, and
 “ accordingly *He* thinks it very reasonable, that
 “ no Bills concerning Religion should be preferred or received into the House of Commons,
 “ unless the same be first considered and liked by
 “ the Clergy.”

What Impression is this intended to make upon the Reader, but to represent our learned Author, as prescribing Rules to the Legislature, and with a Sort of regal Authority directing their Counsels? A Thing indeed too common at present amongst Writers of much less Note. He thinks it very Reasonable! But let us take his own Words *,
 “ As to the making of Laws concerning Religion,
 “ by the Temporality in Parliament, that is a
 “ Point not to be touched for many Reasons: But
 “ I hope it will be no Offence to mention, what
 “ has heretofore pass’d between the Court and
 “ the House of Commons upon this Head, especially since it has been already published by
 “ an eminent † Member of that House. *May 22.*
 “ *1572, 14 Eliz.* It is signified by the Speaker,
 “ *That her Majesty’s Pleasure is, That from henceforth, no Bill concerning Religion shall be preferred or received into this House, unless the same should be first considered, and liked by the Clergy.*”

What now becomes of that dictatorial Air wherein they are represented? a Recital only of the Royal Message, in those Words which might become the Royal Mouth, at that time jealous of

* Pref. p. 20, 21.

† D’ Ewe’s Journal, p. 213.

the Supremacy ; a Point, perhaps, not sufficiently considered by the Author of the Letter.

But whether this were reasonable or not, requires no further Justification, as to this Passage, than to say that it came from the Mouth of that great Princess, who was at that Time the Glory of the Reformation, the Support of the Protestant Interest abroad, the Guardian of the Liberties of *Europe* ; steady in her Counsels, happy in a wise and able Ministry, superior to popular Clamours raised by disaffected, disappointed Persons, against Reason, and without Foundation.

The next Passage that comes under Consideration is, " And particularly, he would not have " the spiritual Courts prohibited by the Courts " of King's Bench and Common Pleas : " Tho' this Sentence is transposed by the Author of the Letter ; yet had he added, " But that Prohibitions being original Writs, should issue from " the Court of Chancery only ; " it had lost its Sting.

After the learned Author in his Preface * has recited part of the Statute of Appeals, 24 *Hen. 8.* and an excellent Remark of the Lord *Coke* thereon in the following Words, " *Certain it is, that this Kingdom hath been best Governed, and Peace and Quiet preserved, when both Parties, that is, when the Justices of the Temporal Courts, and the ecclesiastical Judges have kept themselves within their proper Jurisdiction, without incroaching or usurping upon one another :* " He goes on to observe, that it is not the likeliest Way to obtain that important End, that the one should be set as a Judge over the other, and prescribe Bounds to it : that it would not be a good Expedient for preserving bounds of any other Kind : He mentions

* P. 18, 19.

the Complaint that was made in the Time of K. *James I.* by Archbishop *Bancroft*, against granting Prohibitions by the Courts of King's Bench and Common Pleas, wherein it is insisted that all such Kinds of Prohibitions, being original Writs, ought only to issue out of Chancery, and that such had been the antient Practice: To which the Judges answered, That by Law they ought to do, and always had done so, and were bound by Oath to do it; but if it shall be holden inconvenient, and they can, in Discharge thereof, obtain an Act of Parliament to take it from all other Courts than the Chancery, they should do them great Ease. Hereupon the learned Author observes, that there is an apparent Equity in appointing some common Umpire to determine, as oft as Controversies arise about their respective Bounds; and as the Judges of the Common Law had declared it was a Burthen to them, it was pity, if what was alledged on one side was true, that it properly belonged to another Court, that they did not discharge themselves; or if it be more true what the Judges alledged, that it was a Burden which the Constitution had laid upon them, that a Discharge was not obtained of the temporal Legislature: This I think is the Substance of the Argument, and I shall not enter further into it than the Objection against him has occasioned.

Does he hereby, as is insinuated, desire an Alteration in our Constitution? Far otherwise; it is that each Jurisdiction should be kept within its proper Bounds, without encroaching the one upon the other. This is keeping strictly to, not altering, the Constitution.

The Question then will be, Whether the learned Author's Argument be well founded? and, Whether the Equity of having a common Umpire to determine the Bounds of Jurisdictions,
be

be apparent? But it may be said, that the Law is otherwise; and the Judges must act according to Law. Admitting that it is, yet will not the strictest Common Lawyer allow, that in many Cases, the Law is, and the Judges must determine one way, altho' in Equity it is otherwise: Where then is the Offence in saying, That as in all Cases it is equitable to have a common Umpire to determine Controversies, it is pity there is not one in this? But supposing this Opinion were singular, and no Complaint had ever before been made, no Bishop or Archbishop had ever before desired it, Can this Champion for Liberty, this Defender of the Right that every one has to judge for himself in Matters of Religion, with Justice censure one, who in what is allowed to be called a Matter of Speculation only, thinks and argues different from him? Have not different Opinions prevailed amongst the Lawyers, and even in the same Courts at different Times? Have not the Judges at one Time been unanimous in a Point of Law, which has afterwards at least been doubtful? *Multa renascuntur quæ jam cecidère.* Did not, at one Time *, all the Judges in *England*, and the Attorney-General, subscribe their Opinion before the King in Council, in relation to the Admiralty Jurisdiction, That Suit might be commenced there for Contracts made, and other Things personal done beyond the Seas? And that, if Suit be there for Freight, or Breach of Charter-parties for Voyages to be made beyond the Seas, tho' the Charter-party happen to be made within the Realm, so as the Penalty be not demanded, a Prohibition is not to be granted?

* 18 Feb. 1632. present his Majesty, the Lord Keeper, and 23 Lords of the Council. *Vide* Exton's *Marit. Dicæolog.* n fine.

And if Suit be for Building, Amending, or Victualling a Ship, against the Ship itself and not against any Party by Name, but such as for his Interest makes himself a Party, no Prohibition is to be granted, tho' this be done within the Realm; and yet, hath not each Particular hereof been since esteemed not to be Law, and Prohibitions been frequently granted? Do not Ships of great Burden frequently arrive within the Ward of *Cheap*, in order by a Fiction of Law to give the Right of Action to the temporal Courts? If then the Bounds of Jurisdictions are thus various, Is he to be MARKED as an Enemy to Liberty, who wishes that all Controversies relating to those Bounds, were left to a common Umpire? Are these the pernicious Principles of which the Consequence is so destructive? or, Is a Diversity of Opinion in Matters of Law, where the Constitution is no ways altered, worse than Heresy, or a Disagreement in Articles of Faith, which affects the Church established by Law, which is a Part of our legal Constitution?

But he may say, That this seems to carry a Reflection, as if the temporal Judges had too far extended the Bounds of their Jurisdiction, and incroached upon the Ordinary. And I am persuaded it was mentioned by him with that View (*Hæ tibi erunt Artes*) vainly to hope to influence them, by insinuating, that "it is now become their own Cause;" for it is otherwise foreign to the Subject, and could not affect the present Opposition. However, it may be said, What Fear can there be from the present Bench of Justices, that Men of their strict Honour and Integrity, should be in the least biased in favour of their own Jurisdiction? As to themselves, I think there will be none; but if we consider the
Pre-

Prevalence of Precedents, especially in the Courts of Law, that they have the Force of Law, we may still expect that they will have some Influence; unless they could be brought to think, that they are every way superior to those who made such Precedents.

Should that Maxim of Law, *Boni Judicis est ampliare Jurisdictionem*, happen to prevail but once in a Century, what Alterations of Law in that Point must the Precedents of that Time make? What a Havock amongst inferior Jurisdictions, or those of which they are to fix the Bounds, if they are to be the Guide to those who come after? If we search those ancient Annals of the Law, *the Year Books*, how few are the Instances of Prohibitions, in comparison of what the last Century has produced? and how can they but increase, if we consider the progressive Power of Precedents, and how easily they are made?

It is well known, that whoever desires a Prohibition, may apply to which of the Common Law Courts in *Westminster-hall* he pleases; and, if refused by one, may go to another; and a Rule being granted upon Motion, if upon shewing Cause to discharge it the Court be equally divided, the Rule must stand, and the Ordinary cannot proceed: Nay, there does not want an * Instance, as I am informed, where the Courts of *King's-Bench* and *Common Pleas* had unanimously refused a Prohibition after Sentence, and it was granted in the Court of *Exchequer* by two Judges against the Opinion of the other, there being only three then upon the Bench. I am far from censuring that Judgment; but relate it only as a Fact, to shew how easily the Precedents for

* Newens against Worth, *Mich.* 1723.

Prohibitions may be multiplied ; and to verify the Inference which is made by our learned Author ; “ That the spiritual Judge finding himself exposed to Prohibitions in almost every Step he takes, reckons it oftentimes more advisable, not to pursue it at all, than to pursue it with so small Probability of Success.”

Another Matter of Complaint is, That he thinks, “ that in spiritual Matters the Clergy may be presumed the most proper Judges, both of the Assistance which the Church stands in Need of from the State, and the several Degrees of it ; and of the Method by which that Assistance may be most effectually conveyed and applied for the Service of the Church. That the Legislature, by putting the Help which it designs for the Church into the Hands of the Laity, does the Church a manifest Dis-service. That wherever it puts the Work of even the Suppression of Vice, into temporal Hands, it puts it into a Channel not so likely to succeed, as in spiritual Hands.”

Here I must refer you to the learned Author's own Argument †, wherein the Deductions are plain, and the Inferences certain. If the Spirituality of this Realm, under his Majesty as their Supreme Head, be sufficient in itself, without the Interposition of any exterior Person in all Matters of a spiritual Nature ; it will follow from thence, That they are the most proper Judges of what Assistance the Church stands in Need of from the State ; for it is a Maxim in Law, *Peritis in Arte sua Credendum est*. If the Correction of Manners, and what relates to the Order and Discipline of the Church, be the proper Province of the Ordinary, according to the Laws of the Land, as

† Preface p. 30, 31.

appears from the before-mentioned Passage of the Lord *Coke* in *Caudrie's Case*, it is then most likely to succeed in their Hands ; and the transferring it from spiritual to temporal Hands, is putting it into a different Channel. If further, the Assistance which the State gives to the Church by new Statutes, occasions thereby frequent Prohibitions to the Interruption of the Ordinary in his Proceedings in spiritual Matters ; and lastly, if these Helps happen to be *unnecessary, or unduly applied*, as the learned Author expresses it ; it likewise follows, that they do no Service, but a manifest Disservice to the Church.

To prove that the Spirituality is in itself sufficient to this End, he refers us to the Words of the Statute, 24 *H. 8. c. 12. § 1.* which is unrepealed, (whereas the 25 *H. 8. c. 14.* quoted by the Author of the *Letter*, has been long since, and upon just Grounds, repealed :) This Statute declares, " That the Realm of *England* is an
 " Empire—governed by one supreme Head
 " and King—Unto whom a Body Politick
 " compact of all Sorts and Degrees of People,
 " divided in Terms and by Names of Spirituality and Temporality, been bounden and owen to
 " bear, next to God, a natural and humble
 " Obedience— The Body Spiritual whereof
 " having Power, when any Cause of the Law
 " Divine happened to come in question, *or of*
 " *Spiritual Learning*, that it was declared, interpreted, and shewed, by that part of the said
 " Body Politick, called the Spirituality, now
 " being usually called the *English Church*,
 " which always hath been reputed, and also
 " found of that sort, that both for Knowledge,
 " Integrity and Sufficiency of Number, it hath
 " been always thought, and is also at this Hour
 " sufficient and meet of itself, without the Inter-
 " meddling

“ meddling of any exterior Person or Persons, to
 “ declare and determine all such Doubts, and to
 “ administer all such Offices and Duties, as to
 “ their Rooms Spiritual doth appertain— And
 “ the Law Temporal, for Trial of Property of
 “ Lands and Goods, and for the Conservation
 “ of the People of this Realm, in Unity and
 “ Peace, without Rapine or Spoil, was, and yet
 “ is, administred, adjudged and executed by
 “ sundry Judges and Ministers of the other Part
 “ of the said Body Politick, called the Tempo-
 “ ralty : And both their Authorities and Juris-
 “ dictions do conjoin together in the due Ad-
 “ ministration of Justice, the one to help the
 “ other.”

If then the Spirituality and the Temporality are
 distinct Members under one common Head, the
 King, Must they not have different Functions?
 If these Functions are transferred from the one
 to the other, it must be prejudicial to both : For,
*If the whole Body were an Eye, where were the
 Hearing ? If the whole were Hearing, where were
 the Smelling ? And if all were one Member, where
 were the Body ?* The Offices and Duties which be-
 long to the Spirituality are before described by
 the Lord Coke, as far as they relate to Order and
 Discipline, and the Correction of Vice ; for it is
 the Matter which distinguishes the Jurisdiction.
 Where a spiritual Person demands a temporal
 Right, or is guilty of a temporal Offence, he
 must sue, or he is to be prosecuted in the tempo-
 ral Courts only ; so where the Offence is spiritual,
 or the Demand, according to the Laws of the
 Land, is of a spiritual Nature, there, altho’ a
 Layman be prosecuted or convened, it for the
 same Reason lies before the proper Ordinary, be-
 cause the King therein ministreth Justice to his
 Subjects by his ecclesiastical Judges: And whe-
 ther

ther the Statutes against Immorality and Profaneness, Cursing and Swearing, Drunkenness, Profanation of the *Lord's-day*, and the like, have more effectually tended to the Suppression of those Offences, let Experience shew.

I believe there is no one of common Experience in the temporal Courts, but will admit, that where Statutes have been made concerning a Matter Spiritual, they have thereby frequently transferred the Conusance thereof solely to the temporal Courts; in others, according to the received Rules of the Common Law, they have at least given a Handle for a Prohibition.

In the Case of Tythes, altho' the Lord *Coke*, in the before-mentioned Case, recites the Subtraction and Right of Tythes amongst those Causes which do not belong to the Common Law, and the Statute 2 and 3 of *Edw. 6. c. 13.* was expressly made to support the Rights of the Clergy, and the Jurisdiction of the Ordinary, and there is a Clause therein, § 13. " That it shall not be lawful unto the Parson, Vicar, Proprietor, Owner, or other their Farmers or Deputies, contrary to this Act, to convent or sue such Withholder of Tythes, Obventions, and other Duties aforesaid, before any other Judge than Ecclesiastical——" Yet have not the Clergy long ago lost almost one Branch of that Income, the personal Tythes, which was intended to have been secured by that Statute, and which was the principal Support of the Ministers in Market Towns?

Surely the Property of the Clergy is become the most precarious of any Subject's in the Kingdom, to be collected and received from Numbers of Parishioners, amongst whom, if there be one contentious/obstinate Man, they may be obliged to expend their little Income in defense of their

Rights, or, if the Point will bear a Dispute, be forced to give them up for ever ; whilst they are uncertain in relation to the Jurisdiction, the Laws various, subject to different Customs, different Modus's almost in every Parish, and those to be tried by a Jury, of which the Clergy have that Privilege that they never are a part.

But as this is of a mixt Nature, a Matter not merely Spiritual, happy would it be for them if their Pastors could, together with the present Sages of the Law, whose great Humanity and Goodness is extensive as their Knowledge, by the kind Interposition of the Legislature, settle some certain and uniform Rule, which might be a Clue to lead them out of this Labyrinth of Law, so disagreeable to them, and unsuitable either to their Fortunes or Profession. An ordinary Workman may help to pull down an antient Building ; but to alter and new model, without endangering the Foundation, requires the Care and Skill of an able Architect.

But to return from this Digression: Has not this very Statute, 2 and 3 *Ed. 6.* been the Foundation of Prohibitions? Have not the several Matters therein contained been almost wholly transferred to the temporal Courts, and the Ordinary can scarce proceed in any Cause of Tythes, by reason of Statutes made in support of his Jurisdiction, or some other temporal Incident, without being exposed to Prohibitions in almost every Step he takes ? It is the same in relation to several other Branches which relate to Order and Discipline, which it is not to my Purpose to be particular in, since the only View with which I mention this, is to take off the Reflection made upon our learned Author, for saying that “ if the “ Helps which the temporal Legislature afford “ the Church, happen to be unnecessary, or applied

“plied in an undue manner, they do not only
 “do no Service, but are a manifest Disservice to
 “the Church.”

Again, It is an Objection against him, that
 “he conceives that temporal Penalties may be
 “useful in Matters of Religion:” and that “The
 “only Way to make them truly beneficial to
 “Religion, is to provide them, as a *further Terror*
 “and *Punishment*, to be called in, as oft as the
 “Censures of the Church are disobeyed.”

And is it possible, that any Gentleman of the
 Temple, who looks into his Book of Statutes,
 especially since the Reformation, can conceive,
 that temporal Penalties may not be useful in Mat-
 ters of Religion, both to the Church and State?
 That they may not be a Guard against those Ex-
 tremes, between which our reformed Church is
 so happily situate, against the Libertinism of In-
 fidelity on the one Hand, and the Superstition of
 Popery on the other? That they may not be a
 Guard against Immorality and Profaneness, against
 those impious Principles which, as the Law de-
 clares, *greatly tend to the Dishonour of Almighty God,*
and may prove destructive to the Peace and Welfare
of the Kingdom? The Suppression of which is the
 utmost *Extent or Consequence* aim'd at by the Prin-
 ciples laid down by our learned Author. Or will
 he deny that the Laws relating to Blasphemy, the
 Denial of the Blessed Trinity, the depraving the
 Book of Common Prayer, Neglect of Divine
 Worship, Swearing and the like, relate to Matters
 of Religion? Sure I am he cannot: The Que-
 stion then is, In what Manner may they be made
 the most useful? How are they to be made most
 truly beneficial? Whether by transferring the Conu-
 sance thereof to the temporal Courts; and that
 how Spiritual soever they may be in their Nature,
 they should be reckoned no longer a spiritual Care;
 or

or whether they should be provided as supplemental to the Laws of the Church, and to inforce Obedience where the Power of those Laws is too weak, to be *called in* as a further Terror and Punishment, as oft as its Censures are disobeyed : And that the Words, *called in*, may give no Offence, I would observe, that it is the Language of the Law, *Invocare Brachium Seculare*, when the Bishop humbly signifies to his Majesty the Nature of the Offence, the Contempt of the Party, that his Power is insufficient, and therefore prays the Aid of the temporal Authority. Thus as the Statute expresses it, the one conjoyns to help the other.

In some of the Statutes which relate to the Matters before mentioned, there is an Express Reservation of the Bishop's Jurisdiction ; in others there is none. If for want of that, it ceases to be a spiritual Offence, and becomes merely of temporal Cognisance, so that from the highest to the lowest Minister of the Church, from the Prelate to the Parish Clark, they are intirely exempted from its Censures, I submit it to any indifferent Person, whether in that Method it may be so truly beneficial to Religion, as in the other where it is supplemental only, and without retrenching the Power of the Ordinary.

Let us consider the Statute made in the Reign of our Great Deliverer, when our civil and spiritual Rights and Liberties were secured, and settled, upon a just and true Foundation, and which was a penal Statute ; I mean the Act 9 and 10 *W. III.* c. 32. For the more effectual suppressing of Blasphemy and Profaneness. The Preamble thereof sets forth, That " whereas, many Persons have
 " of late Years openly avowed and published
 " many blasphemous and impious Opinions contrary to the Doctrines and Principles of the
 " Christian

“ Christian Religion, greatly tending to the Dishonour of Almighty God, and may prove Destructive to the Peace and Welfare of this Kingdom :”

And for the more effectual suppressing of the said detestable Crimes, it enacts, That “ If any Person having been educated in, or having made Profession of the Christian Religion within this Realm, shall by writing, printing, teaching, or advised Speaking, deny any one of the Persons in the Holy Trinity to be God, or shall assert or maintain that there are more Gods than one, or shall deny the Christian Religion to be true, or the Holy Scriptures of the Old or New Testament to be of Divine Authority, and shall upon Indictment or Information in any of his Majesty’s Courts, at *Westminster*, or at the Assizes, be thereof lawfully convicted by the Oath of two or more credible Witnesses, such Person shall, for the first Offence, be adjudged incapable and disabled in Law,—to have or enjoy any Office or Employment, Ecclesiastical, Civil or Military : And if convicted a second Time, shall be disabled to sue to be Guardian of any Child, or to be an Executor or Administrator, or capable of any Legacy or Deed of Gift, or to bear any Office, Civil or Military, or Benefice Ecclesiastical, and to suffer Imprisonment for three Years.”

And as the Penalty of this Statute is very great, there is a Proviso, “ That no Person shall be prosecuted, by Virtue of this Act, for any Words spoken, unless Information be given upon Oath, before a Justice of Peace, within four Days, and the Prosecution be within three Months.”

That this Statute, and even these severe Penalties in Matters of Religion, were thought expedient by the Legislature at that Time, in order to suppress the Growth of such monstrous Impieties,

ties, is apparent: But as this is a temporal Statute with temporal Punishments, the Prosecution thereof, in the temporal Courts only, and the Judges at Common Law can alone determine upon it; let us suppose a Person to have been guilty of these Enormities, and that either thro' Ignorance, Indolence, or the Fear of being stigmatized as an Informer, a Tale-bearer, an Enemy to all Freedom in Conversation, no Information thereof should be given within four Days, is the Person from that Time to be freed from all Punishment; shall it never after be objected against him; or may the Ordinary inquire into it, and punish the Offender as he might have done before that Statute, there being no express Clause, either to reserve or take away his Jurisdiction? In the common Way of Reasoning, one would think he might, the Prosecution being to a different Effect, and not to inflict the Penalty of the Statute; and many learned Judges have been of that Opinion. Besides, as the End propos'd is the Suppression of those Impieties, the suppressing any Power of doing it, is not the most effectual Way to obtain that End. But will the learned Gentleman of the Temple assure them, that if this Case should happen, it would be impossible that a Prohibition should be ever granted, or that they shall not even be stopped by a Rule, and be put to the Charge and Trouble of defending it against a Prohibition? If it be possible, nay, if there should be likewise great Authorities from Precedents in other Cases on that Side of the Question; if there be at least any Room for Dispute, he ought more seriously and dispassionately to have considered that Point, before he had presumed to censure his Opinion, who thinks that it might be more beneficial to Religion, that such Penalties should be provided as a further Terror and Punish-

Punishment, and in Aid of the Censures of the Church.

If then *such Notions* as these for promoting of Order and Discipline, and a due Administration of the *Lawful Power of the Church*, under the Authority of his Majesty, as its supreme Head; *If such Principles, for the Service of the Church of England as by Law established*, when consider'd in their just *Extent and Consequence*, may easily account for what has happened; *Why then has Heaven and Earth been moved to guard against the Tendency of them?* Why then does he take the *Liberty of spreading Infamy and Scandal against this Right Reverend Prelate, without Grounds, and without Reason?* When these Principles are only in Support of the legal Power of that Member of the Body Politick, called the Spirituality, or the Church of *England*, under his Majesty, and of the Authority which the Laws of the Land, and the Constitution of this Realm has vested in its Governours.

Is it because *his Majesty has been sometimes pleased to consult, and advise with him about the Fitness of Persons for spiritual Preferments?* Is not his Majesty to have that Liberty which his meanest Subject enjoys, of advising and consulting with whom he pleases? Cannot he, in his great Wisdom, best distinguish, who are most proper to consult with? It is not now the Question, whether a Layman may not recommend to a Bishoprick, but whether an Ecclesiastick may be consulted with thereupon. Difficult is the Situation of a great Man! If when his Majesty is graciously pleased to advise with him, he did not declare his Sentiments with the utmost Sincerity, he would be unfaithful to his Prince, betray his Confidence, and not deserve his Favour: If he does, he may possibly disoblige some

D

other

other great Man, his Friend, or his Friend's Friend: And if he cannot be render'd suspected to his Master, he is then by little Arts, and false Insinuations, to be made odious to the People.

If the Question were to be asked again, what shall be done to the Man whom the King delights to honour? The Answer from the common Practice now in Use will be; he shall be treated as an Oppressor of his Country, as an Enemy to Liberty, as a Persecutor of real Merit: He shall not only be subject to the Lash of ingenious, designing Malice, but shall become the Theme of the Swiss auxiliary Pens to common News Writers, who know but little more either of the Cause, or the Person, than that the Man is Great, and is to be abused.

Having observed thus much upon what has been objected against the Principles of this learned Prelate, you will with more Ease reflect, that the present Opposition has nothing singular or personal in it; and that without straining the Argument I may have the Liberty of applying it to different Persons, and to inquire into, and support the Reasonableness of the Opposition given by his G——ce, to Dr. S——l C——k's Promotion.

First then to inquire, whether he was a true Friend to our Constitution: If I may apply to Dr. S——l C——k the Character given by the Author of the Letter to Dr. R——, I shall leave it to any *serious and dispassionate* Person, whether it can be affirmed that he was.

If Dr. R—— be injured by the Character the Author of that Letter has given of him, it will lie at his Door: *For what will his Enemies* (if he has any) *think of him, if his Friend treats him thus!* If Dr. S——l C——k be injured by the Comparison, I shall leave it upon the learned Author

of

of his Life, who is himself a great Friend to Liberty.

But as in all Arguments with those who claim the Liberty of Free-thinking, it is necessary to support the first Principles or Foundation, I shall explain myself in what I mean by OUR CONSTITUTION, which is the present Establishment both of Church and State, under his Majesty as the Supreme Head of both, and the Protestant Succession in his Illustrious House: And whatsoever Principles shall tend to lessen the Security of either, may in the End prove destructive to our Constitution.

But as no one, I believe, ever doubted the Doctor's Zeal and Affection for the present Royal Family, and for our legal Establishment as far as it related to the State, I shall not therefore trouble you upon that Head with my Observations, but only shew that the general Latitude, the unlimited Toleration that is contended for, as it must hurt one Part of the Constitution, will in Consequence weaken the other, and further the Designs of those who are Enemies to both; for that the Establishment of the Church is so interwoven with our Constitution, is so essential a Part of it, that they have always suffered together.

I shall shew from the Laws in being, that the Church of *England* is part of the legal Constitution of the Realm of *England*, confirmed by Magna Charta, settled at the Reformation according to its primitive Institution, restored with the Monarchy after the unhappy Troubles, established together with our civil Liberties under our glorious Deliverer King *William*, and secured by the happy Succession of the present Royal Family.

Whosoever will look into the *Saxon* Antiquities, and the Remains of the *Saxon* Laws, will find

find that before the Conquest, the Church was a Part of the Constitution: The Administration of the Laws relating to its Order and Discipline was in the Bishops and Governors of the Church, under the King, and was called by the peculiar Title of † Christianity; and as to the Reformation of Manners and Correction of Vice, the Bishops * sat in Judgment together with the secular Judges. In the *Conqueror's* Time, by a Charter from him, their Courts were made intirely distinct and separate from the temporal Courts, but their Authority was no way diminished. So that the before-mentioned Statute, 24 *H.* 8. which describes the Realm of *England* to be an Empire under the King the Supreme Head, and a Body Politick consisting of the Spirituality and Temporality, with their distinct Offices and Functions, was only declaratory of the ancient Law.

The *Saxon* Laws, especially those collected by *Edward the Confessor*, were still the Darling of the *Englisch* Nation, and after many Struggles were, in the principal Parts thereof, confirmed by *Magna Charta*, by the first Article whereof it is granted, That the Church of *England* shall be Free, and have her whole Rights and Liberties inviolable, 9 *H.* 3. which was confirmed in many succeeding Reigns. Thus the Rights of the Church and the Liberties of the Subject have the same Foundation.

† Christianitas, & ea quæ ad Christianitatem pertinent, passim apud Eadmerum & alios illius *Ævi* Scriptores, Functionem Episcopalem, atque Fori sacri actionem & administrationem seu officium Episcopale, ut usitatius appellatur, denotant. *Selden* in Not. ad Eadmerum, p. 208.

* Debent Episcopi cum *Sæculi* Judicibus interesse judiciis, ne permittant, si possint, ut illinc aliqua pravitatum germina pullulaverint. *Chron. Jo. Brompton* de Leg. *Æthelst.* Reg. *Seld.* in Not. ad Eadm. p. 167.

The papal Power had made many Incroachments both on Church and State ; and besides the several bold and daring Attempts both on the King and People, even pretending to dispose of the Crown, and discharge the Subjects from their Allegiance, had likewise usurped the Regal Supremacy, had beggared the Secular Clergy to support the Pride and Laziness of the Regulars, those holy Drones, who were the Tools of its Power and Avarice. The superior Clergy were made subservient to its Ends, their best Preferments anticipated by Bulls and Provisions, forced to take their Investitures from, and to become tributary to, the See of *Rome*, their Decrees subjected to Appeals to his pretended Holiness. Both the Spirituality and Temporality, at times, resented this Usage ; and many wholesome Laws were made to prevent it : but the Evils were never effectually removed till the Nation was at last cured of its Blindness, and the Yoke thrown entirely off at the Reformation ; which at first went on but slow, and when it had arrived almost to Perfection, was again interrupted by the cruel and bloody Reign of Queen *Mary* ; but was afterwards completed by the great Queen *Elizabeth*, and the Church of *England*, which had been cemented with the Blood of the Martyrs, was settled upon its primitive Foundation.

The Head and Body were now no longer divided, but the Supremacy was annexed to the Crown for ever, and it was enacted by Authority of Parliament, 1 *Eliz.* c. 1. § 17. That such Jurisdictions, Privileges, Superiorities, and Preheminencies spiritual and ecclesiastical as by any spiritual or ecclesiastical Power or Authority hath heretofore been, or may lawfully be exercised or used, for the Visitation of the ecclesiastical State and Persons, and for Reformation, Order,

or

or Correction of the same, and of all manner of Errors, Heresies, Schisms, Abuses, Offences, Contempts and Enormities, shall for ever be united and annexed to the Imperial Crown of this Realm.

And altho' by the same Act, the Exigence of the Times so requiring, a Power was granted to the Crown to appoint Commissioners to inquire into, to visit, correct and reform ecclesiastical Offences, yet as they afterwards extended the Bounds of their Jurisdiction, incroaching upon the Right of the proper Ordinary, and were made use of in a manner different from the Intention of their Institution, to serve slavish Purposes, and as it was putting the Correction of Vice into a different Channel, it was at the happy Revolution declared illegal, and justly abolished, and the Bishops Jurisdiction under the regal Supremacy, left to the Laws of the Established Church.

Under the happy Reign of this good Queen, always jealous of her legal Supremacy and the just Prerogatives of the Crown, was the Doctrine and Worship of the Church of *England* settled and established; the Act of Uniformity made in the pious Reign of King *Ed. VI.* revived and confirmed, the Liturgy of the Church of *England* revised, and the Articles of Religion drawn up and agreed to by the Clergy in Convocation, 1562, and required to be subscribed by all Persons to be admitted to any Benefice with Cure, 13 *Eliz. c. 12.*

But different Opinions soon arose even amongst those who professed the same common Faith, and were united under the same political Head, as thro' human Frailty it cannot well be otherwise: The Church, as an indulgent Mother, was willing to open her Arms to receive all, even her weakest

weakest Children, and several Attempts were made to that Purpose, particularly in the following Reign: But their Opinions were so various, their Differences so irreconcilable, and each so strenuous for their own Tenets, that it was at last found impracticable.

The bold and open Attempts of the Papists in King *James First's* Reign, which proceeded so far as to conspire the total Destruction both of Church and State, and by one decisive Blow to extirpate the King and the whole Royal Family, together with the Three Estates of the Realm in Parliament assembled, made it necessary for the Preservation of the Constitution, to enforce the Laws in being against Non-conformity, and to make some other severe Laws for its further Security; but there was not a sufficient Distinction made betwixt those who offended out of malicious Wickedness, and those whom the Scruples of a tender Conscience would not permit to conform to the Rules of the Established Church; and a limited Toleration was not then, at least effectually, thought of, but was reserved by Providence for the Glory of the Revolution.

The Uneasiness that this created was fomented by the Arts of *Rome*, whose Emissaries turned themselves into all Shapes, invented new Errors, revived old ones, in order to increase the Divisions, and widen the Breach; till at last in the next Reign, thro' the Religious Differences, together with some other unhappy Circumstances that attended that Reign, our whole Constitution, both our Church and Monarchy were entirely subverted.

Here was a Time that one would have thought these Friends of Liberty might have triumphed, when every one claimed an uncontrollable Right to judge for himself in Matters of Religion; when

when all was left to his own Decision, and they were free to stile whatever they pleased *Reason and Scripture*, however gross and absurd it were, *without any temporal Penalties, Inconveniences or Discouragements on either side of the Question*. But did it in effect prove so? Quite otherwise: Each Sect, each Division was grown as inveterate against the other as they had before been against the Church; they out prayed, and out canted each other, till at last being tired with Anarchy and Confusion, they were glad to return to the settled Establishment; and those who, even in religious Matters, thought to have bettered themselves, experienced that they had only changed a lawful Government for lawless Tyranny, and they themselves helped forward the Restoration.

As fatal Experience had now taught the Nation how much the State suffered by Diversity of Opinions in religious Matters, and the Necessity of a firm and secure Establishment of the Church together with the State, at the Beginning of the Reign of King *Charles II.* an Act was made for the well governing and regulating of Corporations, 13 *Car. 2.* Stat. 2. c. 1. whereby all Persons were made incapable of being placed or chosen into any Office, Trust, or Employment relating to the Government of any Corporation, who shall not within one Year next before have received the Sacrament according to the Rites of the Church of *England*, (the Prosecution upon which Statute was afterwards, 5 *Geo. 1.* limited to be begun within Six Months.) And soon after, 13 and 14 *Car. 2.* was the Act made for confirming and settling the Uniformity of publick Worship, in the manner it now stands.

Yet the Mischiefs that attended the Exile of the Royal Family, soon began to be sensibly per-

perceived by the Nation : The presumptive Heir to the Crown was a professed and bigotted Papist, the Principles of the Possessor of it, at least doubtful : Those of the Church of *Rome*, who are never wanting to improve the least Opportunity, but are sedulous and watchful for our Ruin, began to flock over in great Numbers, and the Fears of Popery and arbitrary Power, which have always been inseparable, began to be terrible to the Lovers of our Constitution ; new penal Laws were made, and old ones enforced ; but principally, and with the strictest Rigour, against the Dissenters, in order to make them uneasy with the Church Government, and to wish for and promote a Toleration on any Terms, tho' general and unlimited, so as to let in the Papists as well as themselves.

The Church itself was left too unguarded by the State, it wanted some proper Bulwarks, both to secure itself and to keep out the common Enemy : Papists, as well as Dissenters, were got into Corporations, and even into the Legislature, and unless that could be prevented, the Iniquity of the Church of *Rome* might in time have again been established by Law ; the Parliament, who were watchful for our Constitution, supported by the Voice of the greatest part of the Nation, at several Times prepared those Bills, which were then designed for, and have since proved, the greatest Security both to Church and State ; and the King, who was by no means inclined again to visit *Breda*, consented thereto. By the first, which was 25 *Car.* 2. c. 2. and is called the Test Act, it was enacted, That every Person to be admitted into any Office, Civil or Military, or to any Place of Trust under his Majesty, or in the Navy, shall take the Oaths of Allegiance and

E

Supre-

Supremacy, and receive the Sacrament according to the Usage of the Church of *England*, upon some Lord's Day within three Months after their Admittance, and shall likewise subscribe a Declaration against Transubstantiation: The other 30 *Car. II. c. 1. St. 2.* was to disable Papiſts from ſitting in either Houſe of Parliament, by obliging both Peers and Commoners to take the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, and to ſubſcribe the Declaration againſt Tranſubſtantiation.

Thus the great Deſtruction that had been wrought by the too great Libertiniſm in Matters of Religion, which was then ſo freſh in their Memory, at the Beginning of this Reign; and the Dangers of Popery, which apparently threatned them at the latter End of it, produced thoſe ſalutary Laws, for the Preſervation of the Church and Nation, which have always ſtood as the ſtrongeſt Bulwarks againſt Popery; and whenever any Attack has been made upon our Conſtitution, it has begun there; and let who will carry it on outwardly, look further into the Trenches, and you will always find the Papiſts at work in ſapping the Foundation.

For in the next Reign, when the Mask was thrown aſide, and Popery with all its Pomps and Fooleries appeared open and barefaced in our Streets, theſe Laws ſtill ſtood in their Way. What is then to be done? The Nation was not ſo infatuated as to repeal them, and it was in vain to think of attempting it by Authority of Parliament. The Laws are therefore to be ſuſpended, and the Crown claims an arbitrary and diſpenſing Power: Then comes out that DECLARATION for Liberty of Conſcience, in the ſame unreſtrained, unlimited Manner, as the Author of the Letter contends for.

The

The sober and considering Part of the Dissenters are not less alarmed at it, than was the Church itself; *Timent Danaos & dona ferentes*: they saw thro' the Pretence, and altho it was called an Indulgence to them, perceived that it was really designed for the general Destruction. Not so the rest: Numbers of the Anabaptists, Quakers, Independants, Presbyterians, as well as the Papists, approach the Throne with Addresses of Thanks and Joy, for that invaluable Favour and Benefit derived to them from the Royal Clemency; that it should be asserted from the Royal Seat, that Conscience ought not to be restrained, and that there were now no Limitations to hinder the enjoyment of it: These were their Words, with other Pieces of servile Flattery.

When Orders are sent for the Publication of it in all Churches, the Bishops and Clergy of the Church of *England* are astonished; the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and six of the Bishops join in a Petition to his Majesty, express their Dislike of it, and humbly desire, that the Publication thereof may not be insisted on: But they are looked upon only as a *Cabal of Bishops, putting a Negative upon the Crown*; their Petition is called a Libel, and they are committed to the Tower; tho' they were afterwards, upon their Trial, acquitted, to the inexpressible Joy of all those who had not vowed Destruction to our Constitution. Those of the Judges who were the Friends of true Liberty, and had the Courage and Integrity to deliver their Opinions according to Law, were dismissed from their employments; whilst such rash Measures hastned the happy Revolution: and at last this unfortunate Prince, misled by violent Counsels, blinded by his Zeal, and a Slave to the Arts of *Rome*, brought upon himself his own Misfortunes.

Now golden Days return, and Justice, which had left the Nation, is brought back in Triumph by our great Deliverer, and the Imperial Crown is placed on the Head of him and his Royal Consort, his Partner in the Empire, to the unfeigned Joy of the People: in order to this the Coronation Oath is established, and therein they swear upon the Holy Evangelists, that they will, to the uttermost of their Power, maintain the Laws of God, the true Profession of the Gospel and Protestant reformed Religion, *established by Law*; that they will preserve unto the Bishops and Clergy of this Realm, and to the Churches committed to their Charge, all such *Rights and Privileges*, as by Law do, or shall appertain to them, or any of them, 1 *Gul. & Mariæ, St. 1. C. 6.*

Their first and earliest Care was to give Relief to tender Consciences, to exempt their Protestant Subjects, dissenting from the Church of *England*, from the Penalties of certain Laws, by an Act of Parliament, called the Toleration Act 1 *Gul. & Mariæ, St. 1. C. 18.* which I must refer you to, and which you will find to be far from an unlimited, unrestrained Toleration: It did not give a Toleration to all, did not establish a Right of private Judgment in Matters of Religion to all Persons, without any Inconveniencies or Discouragements, but was intended to make the Dissenters easy, and the Church secure; the Papists and those who denied the Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, were excepted, and the Laws which had been provided against those who neglected Divine Service on the Lord's Day were left in force, to be executed against all who did not come to some Assembly of religious Worship, allowed or permitted by that Act.

Thus by the miraculous Interposition of Providence, was this great Change brought about, and both our civil and religious Rights preserved and established; whilst thro' the Imprudence of some designing, hot-headed Zealots, a neighbouring Kingdom was forced to give up one part of their Establishment to preserve the other, or both might have inevitably perished.

The Reign of our great Deliverer was chiefly employed in defending those Blessings he had procured for us, and defending the Liberties of *Europe*, from the Designs of one, who aimed at universal Monarchy, but not without some Disturbances at home, from those always restless, always turbulent Spirits, that strove to bring us back to our former Slavery; which went so far as even to Attempts upon his precious Life: but Providence still watching over us, defeated their Designs. He, fearless for himself, yet feared for us. To give us only a Prospect of Liberty, a transient Enjoyment of its Sweets, with Danger of returning to our Chains again, was short of his extensive Goodness; his Thoughts were employed how to perpetuate our Happiness to us. The Nation was sensible, that to have a Popish Head to a Protestant Body, must make a Monster of our Constitution: From his great Genius then, from his extensive Thought for the Good of future Ages, proceeded the Settlement of the Protestant Succession in the present Royal Family; this was his last Care, his last kind Legacy to us, when he was going to Immortality; and by the Act 12 and 13 of his Reign, intituled, An Act for the further Limitation of the Crown, and better securing the Rights and Liberties of the Subject, for the Happiness of the Nation and Security of our Religion (as that Act recites, and as we have found)

found) The Succession to this Realm was settled in the illustrious House of *Hanover*. The Successors were enjoined to take the Coronation Oath, and to subscribe the Declaration according to the 1st *W. and M.* And by a special Clause, *All the Laws and Statutes of the Realm, for securing the established Religion, and the Liberties of the People, then in Force, were ratified and confirmed.*

To the Memory of this immortal Prince, let every *English* Heart pay grateful Acknowledgements; and instead of those Temples which the Ancients would have raised to their *Jupiter Stator*, or those Adorations which the almost as blind Ages would have paid to their tutelar Saints; let us return Thanks to that Almighty Power, that first inspired, and then enabled him to perfect this great Design, thus to preserve, to settle, to secure our Church and Nation; and let those, who from his auspicious Reign, enjoy so great Freedom, never imploy it to the Disturbance of the publick Tranquility.

The Glory of the next Reign was to pursue his Steps. The Bravery and Success of those Arms, which he had taught the Art of War, and which he used to Conquest, under that experienced, that great, that invincible Hero the Duke of *Marlborough*, will ever make the brightest Show in our *English* Annals. The Protestant Interest supported, the Empire saved, the Balance of *Europe* preserved! Whilst he had scarce an Enemy left to conquer, but the Folly and Ingratitude of his own Countrymen.

But whilst her Arms were thus imployed abroad, the Counsels of this pious Queen were thoughtful for our Peace at home: Her Bounty to the poorer Clergy, ought not, will not, ever be forgot, whilst the Weight of worldly Cares

is

is made easier to them, and they may, in Time, attend their Holy Functions without being exposed to Penury and Want. And as to the more publick Affairs; the Scheme for the Union of the Two Kingdoms was now brought to Perfection. It was easily foreseen what Misfortunes a different Successor to these Crowns, after the Queen's Death, might occasion: Tho' theirs, the Succession to which was not as yet settled, was more exposed to Danger; yet it might have proved of fatal Consequence to both, and the Swords of these brave Nations might have been employed against each other, which united would be able to bring the stubbornest Power in *Europe* to Reason.

The different Establishment of their several Churches, as it was a present Obstacle, might, if not provided for, after the Legislature was become one and the same, have occasioned such Differences as might have turned to the Subversion of the one or the other. They had provided by an Act of Parliament in *Scotland*, for the Security of their Establishment, which was made a fundamental Part of the Treaty of Union. And in the same manner the Parliament of *England* passed an Act, 5 *Annæ*, c. 5. for securing of the Church of *England* as by Law established; which recites, § 1. " That whereas it
 " was reasonable and necessary that the true Pro-
 " testant Religion professed and established by
 " Law in the Church of *England*, and the Doc-
 " TRINE, WORSHIP, DISCIPLINE, and GOVERN-
 " MENT thereof should be effectually and UN-
 " ALTERABLY secured; it is therefore enacted,
 " That the Act 13 *Eliz.* intituled, An Act for the
 " Ministers of the Church to be of sound Re-
 " ligion. And another Act made 13 *Car.* 2.
 in-

“ intitled, An Act for the Uniformity of pub-
 “ lick Prayers— (Other than such Clauses as
 “ in the said Acts, or either of them, have been
 “ repealed or altered by any subsequent Act or
 “ Acts of Parliament) *And all and Singular o-*
 “ *ther Acts of Parliament now in force*, for the
 “ Establishment and *Preservation* of the Church
 “ of *England*, and the *Doctrine, Worship, Disci-*
 “ *pline*, and *Government* thereof, shall remain and
 “ be in full force for ever. § 2. And after the
 “ Demise of her Majesty, the Sovereign next
 “ succeeding, and so for ever hereafter, every
 “ King or Queen succeeding and coming to the
 “ Royal Government of the Kingdom of *Great*
 “ *Britain*, at his or her Coronation, shall take
 “ and subscribe an Oath, to maintain and pre-
 “ serve *inviolably* the said Settlement of the Church
 “ of *England*, and the *Doctrine, Worship, Disci-*
 “ *pline* and *Government* thereof as by Law esta-
 “ blished within the Kingdoms of *England* and
 “ *Ireland*, the Dominion of *Wales*, and Town of
 “ *Berwick upon Tweed*, and the Territories thereto
 “ belonging. § 3. And that this Act, and all and
 “ every Matters and Things therein contained, be
 “ and shall for ever be holden and adjudged to
 “ be a *Fundamental* and *Essential* Part of any
 “ Treaty of Union to be concluded between the
 “ said Two Kingdoms. And also that this Act
 “ shall be inserted in exprefs Terms, in any Act
 “ of Parliament which shall be made for the set-
 “ tling and ratifying any such Treaty of Union,
 “ and shall be therein declared to be an *Essential*
 “ and *Fundamental* Part thereof.” And accord-
 “ ingly, in the Act made 5 *Annæ*, c. 8. for the
 “ Union of the Two Kingdoms of *England* and
 “ *Scotland*, it is in exprefs Terms, and in those very
 “ Words, totally inserted.

The

The Union being thus completed, it was the Care of our good Queen and her then Ministry, to provide for the further Security of the Protestant Succession; and an Act passed 6 *Annæ*, c. 7. whereby Provision was made for the Continuance and Sitting of the Parliament in case of the Queen's Demise, and the Continuance of the Privy Council and great Officers of the Crown for Six Months, unless discharged by the Successor; and in case of his or her Absence, Lords Justices were appointed to exercise the Regal Authority in his or her Name; but there was this Proviso, § 17. That it should be High Treason for any of them to give the Royal Assent to any Bill for repealing or altering the Act of Uniformity 13 & 14 *Car.* 2.

Here let us stand and take a Prospect of our Constitution, and we shall see at the greatest distance of Time, the Church of *England* always as a Part of it: Still at a Distance we perceive Clouds of Error, Misery, and Persecution, obscure its Face; but those are dispelled, and nearer it appears in its primitive Lustre. Then again it is fallen with the State, and almost buried under Heaps of wild Opinions, popular Fury and Distraction; yet rises again, and altho' surrounded by its old Enemies, Error and Confusion, and brought even to the Brink of Ruin, we see it miraculously delivered from them, and fixed and settled here upon a sure and lasting Basis, with such Outworks, that whilst they remain, the Malice of *Rome*, or the Confusion of Discord, cannot approach it, but it will be ever safe and secure.

Especially if we change our View, and take our Prospect forward; where we find it supported by that Royal Family which was its only Hopes and Refuge: Here the pleasing Prospect is delightful, here let us bound our Sight; for nothing greater, nothing more wished for can

appear, only we hope and believe it will continue on the same to the greatest Distance of future Ages. We see a King, Great, Just and Good; a Queen, adorned with all the Graces, all the Virtues of her Sex, designed by Heaven to be a Blessing to this Church and Nation: We see the Heir to the Imperial Crown the Hopes and Glory of the succeeding Age; a numerous Royal Issue to make this and other Nations happy. But it would be vain in me to trace the Lines of that Piece, which must be reserved for a superior Pencil.

Having then shewn what our Constitution is, and that the Church of *England* is an essential Part of it, it will bring on the Inquiry, Whether the Doctor whom his Gr——e opposed, could be called a Friend to the Constitution? Was he a Friend to the Doctrine and Worship of the Church of *England*? And did he desire, or would he not, if in Power, have used his Endeavours, to have it altered in some essential Points? If Mr. *W——n*, the learned Author of his Life, may answer for him, there may be sufficient Foundation to think, that he did not approve of its Doctrine and Worship, but desired to have it altered. Could that be done without breaking thro' those Laws which have been made for its Preservation, and are declared to be fundamental and essential to the Union of the Two Kingdoms, and established on the same Foundation with the Protestant Succession, and the Rights and Liberties of the Subject? And can such a one be called a Friend to the Constitution?

It may be urged, " That the Doctor was a
 " Conformist to the Religion established, had
 " subscribed the Articles of our Church, had
 " given his Assent and Consent to the Book of
 " *Common-Prayer*, had declared that the King's

" Ma-

“ Majesty, under God, is the only supreme Governor of this Realm, and that he had given as strong an Evidence as any Man has, or can give of his Conformity, or as the Law requires he should give.” If this be all true, let that learned Author of his Life account for it, and whether a scrupulous Dissenter does not act much more consistent with himself: But I would observe, That there is a wide Difference between a Right, and a Reward ; he that keeps out of the Reach of the Law may demand the one, but something more may be required to intitle him to the other.

However, the Author of the Letter says, that declaring a Dislike of some certain Things in our Establishment, or openly declaring his Wishes that they were altered, is not sufficient to justify the charging any Man with being an Enemy to our Constitution ; That several great Men have done, and a Man may wish to have Alterations made, and yet very consistently approve of, and be a zealous Friend to our Constitution : That it is in the ecclesiastical, as in the civil State of Things ; That there may be some temporal Laws now in force, which a very good Subject may reasonably wish to have repealed ; and yet he may continue and be always a hearty Friend and Well-Wisher to our Constitution.”

It is a Concession which I readily accept, tho’ I did not expect it, That it is the same in the ecclesiastical as in the civil State of Things : And I will likewise admit, that some Laws may be altered and new ones made without hurting the Constitution ; and in the Nature of Things it must be so, as new Incidents happen, new Doubts arise, or Errors either in Law or Practice take place ; but our Constitution must be left intire :

New Laws may be made to strengthen it, where it appears too weak ; but where they tend to lessen its Security, it cannot be attempted by a Friend to the Constitution. Thus in the civil State of Things, the Protestant Succession in the present Royal Family, and the Exclusion of a Popish Successor, is an essential and fundamental Part of our Constitution : Can any Friend there-to even wish to have those Laws repealed or altered.

To take Popery in its civil View, might not one reasonably suspect that Person who would have all those *Penalties, Inconveniences, or Discouragements* which the Laws have provided against it, in order to secure the Protestant Succession, to be repealed ? Who could wish that the Papists should equally be capable of all Offices and Trusts in the Government, and be admitted into the Legislature ? And yet there are many of that Persuasion, who as they are not in Power do demean themselves as quiet and good Subjects to his Majesty, and do not offend against the State ; yet no Friend to the Protestant Succession would wish to see them brought into the State, to see them intrusted with the Power of hurting ; since their Principles, when they have Power, so naturally tend to the Subversion of the Protestant Succession, and this without deserving the Imputation of being Persecutors.

Thus likewise in ecclesiastical Affairs : The Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government of the Church of *England*, are an essential and fundamental Part of the Constitution ; And can it be imagined that one who shall openly declare his Dislike thereof, would not, if in Power, attempt its Alteration ? Would he not be for setting aside those Laws which are provided for its Preservation and Security ? And can he be called

called a Friend to that Part of the Constitution? Or shall, in any Case, either relating to the civil or ecclesiastical State, the due and vigorous Administration of the Laws made for their Preservation, be filed Persecution, by any one but by an Enemy to the Constitution?

We are next to consider what the Author of the Letter says of Heresy, " That the Crime consists in teaching a false Doctrine, thro' sinister Ends, thro' private Interests, and thro' some temporal Views; and that the selfish Views must be proved." Where he finds Heresy confined to this I can't imagine; by what Law this Proof is required, or how it is capable of being proved, since Intention is internal. That Popery has these Views, is apparent, yet was it ever held that in order to the Conviction of a Papist, the View was to be proved. Does not the common Experience of almost all Ages teach us, that Enthusiasm, Desire of Novelty, Obstinacy in Opinion in religious Matters, the false Pretence of Conscience, and Self-sufficiency, as well as Heresy, have created infinite Mischiefs to others; not only without any temporal selfish Views, but even apparently contrary to their Interest, tho' I may admit that it is more frequently and generally attended with the other. But be the View what it will the Thing is still the same, and the Consequence as pernicious.

But says this Author, " What is the Thing? What is the Crime itself? That the Laws of the Land have not any where defined what the Crime of Heresy is; nor does he remember any Act of Parliament now in force, that tells us what Offenders shall be judged Hereticks." Does he remember what Lord Coke says, That the King's ecclesiastical Laws are part of the Laws of the Realm; That he enumerates Heresies amongst

mongst the Crimes which are to be determined by ecclesiastical Judges according to those Laws ; That the Power of Correcting the same is expressly, together with and as part of the Regal Supremacy, annexed to the Imperial Crown of this Realm for ever, by the Statute 1 *Eliz.* c. 1. § 17. For the Supremacy implies not only the Exclusion of all foreign Power, but an Affirmance of a Right in the Crown to all such Jurisdictions spiritual and ecclesiastical, as have been used, and may lawfully be exercised ; and his Majesty's Title of *Defender of the Faith*, cannot be denied by any one who acknowledges his Title to the Crown of these Realms.

But not to carry this Point to Particulars, I shall allow, that the Objections to Dr. S——
C——k do none of them imply Want of Learning, Want of good Temper, Defect in Morals, but a Want of Conformity in Opinion, with the *Doctrine and Worship* of the Church of *England*, which is necessary and essential to the Character of a Bishop of that Church. Neither could his great Learning be any Excuse for this Defect, since his Power was thereby the greater, to set those Errors in a more plausible Light, and to lead more into them.

The Miseries that Diversity of Opinions in Religious Matters hath occasioned to the State, has already been taken Notice of ; but it may further be more particularly observed, that notwithstanding the Doctor's Aversion to Popery, the unsettling the profess'd Faith of the Church of *England*, and its Worship, must naturally tend to the Advancement of Popery : for those who have any Religion must necessarily have some Faith ; and if they cannot, with any Certainty, find it in our Church ; if the Men of the greatest
Learn-

Learning, the greatest Divines, nay the Bishops and Pastors of the Church, shall differ therein, how can they be the Guides in other Points; how easily, and what Numbers of Profelytes, may the Church of *Rome* make, by pretending to a sure Rule, and infallible Guide? How would the Trade of that Empyrick in Religion, the Head of that Church, be increased? What numbers might flock to him under the Promises of a certain Cure, and for the Benefit of a Catholick, or universal Medicine?

As the Author of the Letter has told us what Principles he dislikes, in Opposition thereto, he tells you what he approves of: Let me then inquire into his darling Character, which I will not apply to Dr. C——k, nor can I imagine that he had any Authority to apply it to Dr. R——. But let whoever is fond of it, take it: It is the FRIEND to LIBERTY, in the Manner he describes him; and judge from the *Extent and Consequence*, whether it can agree with the Character of a FRIEND to the Constitution, either in Church or State.

He describes him then to be “ One who is studious to promote an UNLIMITED Toleration: that he claims a Right to judge for himself in Matters of Religion, and is willing to allow every Man the same Right: that he wishes all religious Controversies were left to the free and impartial Decision of Reason and Scripture, without annexing any temporal Penalties, *Inconveniencies* or *Discouragements*, to either Side of the Question: And (tho he puts it in the Front) He is likely to promote any Attempts for its Service, and to discourage what may abridge it.” If this be not overthrowing all the Laws which have been made for the *Security* of the *Protestant Succession* and the Church of England, I leave

leave to every serious dispassionate Man to consider.

“ He is studiously to promote an unlimited “ Toleration:” What! are the Popish Priests and Jesuits to be let in amongst us, to the perverting of the People, and overturning of the Constitution, without any temporal Penalty? Are there to be no Penal Laws or Tests, no Denial of Transubstantiation; but are the Fences, both of Church and State, to be thrown down and laid open to all, and even Popery to be tolerated without any Limitation?

But further; it may be allowed, that Man, as a Free Agent, has a natural Right or Power to judge for himself, in all Matters, either Religious or Civil; but with this Restriction, that if he misapplies his Reason, judges wrong, and acts accordingly, he may be subject to such Inconveniencies and Punishments as the Laws of God and Man have ordained: Thus in the civil State of Things, and in Matters temporal, a Man may possibly be of Opinion, that all Things are by Nature common, and ought to continue so; and there have not been wanting those who have entertained such Notions: But where Property is settled by the Laws of the Land, If he should invade it in another, the Law may call it Felony, and he be hanged for a Thief: so in religious Matters, the natural Right which he has to judge for himself, may be restrained and kept within due Bounds by Law, that the ecclesiastical Polity may be secured, and that without any Offence to Liberty; for we are made subject to the Law, that we may be more truly Free: and this Author would himself seem to allow, that there ought to be some Rule of judging, for that all Religious Controversies are to be left to the free and impartial Decision of Reason and Scripture: But

But still what is Scripture? Is it the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, as acknowledged by the Church of *England*, and recited in the Articles of Religion agreed to in 1562, 6th Article? For therein the Freethinkers differ, and some are for discharging Part or admitting more. Who then is to be the Judge? Every Man has a Right, it is said to judge for himself, and that without any Discouragement or Inconvenience; he then must be the Judge of what is Reason, and what is Scripture, and the only Judge, else his Liberty is restrained. Thus if there be no Rule to be fixed by any Authority, the *Jew*, who reckons the Old Testament alone to be Scripture, as he cannot comprehend the Incarnation of our Saviour, makes That and his Reason his Guide; he is therefore to be discharged from all Inconveniencies and Discouragements; that is, he may and ought to be capacitated even for Ecclesiastical Preferments, or it may prove a Discouragement to him. If the Papist shall call Transubstantiation and Infallibility, Image-worship and Purgatory, Reason and Scripture, for he is to judge for himself, he is likewise to be freed from all Penalties, from all Discouragements: Nay we may even be afraid that the *Turk* should call his Alcoran Scripture, and his Way of thinking, Reason, and he is then to be qualified for all manner of Employments. Thus monstrously absurd is this Notion, this Description of Liberty, without one Word of the Restriction by the Laws of the established Church, and the Laws of the Land. How strangely do we wander, when we make not Law our Guide!

But to carry it still further; the very Man who contends that there ought to be no Discouragement in religious Controversies on either Side of

the Question, forgets that he had described his Friend to Liberty to be one who is likely to promote *any Attempts* for its Service, and to *discourage* what may abridge it. I cannot comprehend what he means by *any Attempts* : Any Attempts ! What, in its utmost *Extent and Consequence* ? *Et Tu Brute* ? But to take it, contrary to his Treatment of others, in the mildest Sense ; it must at least imply, that they who would have the Laws preserved, which were made for the Security of the Protestant Succession, and of the Church of *England*, and which settle an Uniformity in Doctrine and Worship, which Laws do undoubtedly inflict Penalties, and bring Inconveniencies and Discouragements on some Persons in Matters of Religion, that they, and they only, are to be discouraged.

Judge then which is the true Friend to the Constitution, he who contends for a steady and vigorous Administration of Justice according to the Laws of the Realm, or this Man of Liberty, who would destroy them all ? For let us consider even his own Inference. “ If the “ Constitution of the Church of *England* is “ such, that whoever maintains Liberty, private Judgment, the supreme Authority of “ Scripture and Reason, and a Right in All “ to a Toleration, by that becomes an Enemy “ to it : What then ? That such a Constitution “ ought not to be preserved.” But neither the Laws of the Church, nor of the State, do admit of a Right in All to a Toleration : *Ergo* -- Let him who dares make the Conclusion. Thus does this Friend to Liberty, from false Premises, draw dangerous Conclusions, and then declares if it be so, that the Constitution is not worth preserving : What is this but stirring up Sedition amongst his Majesty's Subjects, and an

open

open Attack upon the Constitution? Certainly no one can complain of want of Liberty, if such things as these may be wrote with Impunity.

Let us not wonder then, that those who are watchful for the Good of the Church and State, should be called Inquisitors: Surely it is better to be too fearful for our Preservation, to be too suspicious, (if that had been the Case) than to give so great a Latitude. Shall an Obstruction given to any one's Preferment, arising from Suspicions, until those Suspicions are cleared, be called Persecution? Or is the same Evidence, the same Proof, required against any one who is to have a Trust of great Consequence reposed in him, as it would to inflict a Punishment? Ought a Minister to be censured if in an Employment in the State, the Advancement of any one should be retarded upon the least Ground of Suspicion, (let who will recommend him) until he had given full Satisfaction of his Sincerity towards the Protestant Succession? And why may not the same be done in the Church, until a full Satisfaction be given, not only of a Conformity to, but of a thorough Belief and Approbation of the Doctrine and Worship of the Church of *England*? Are the Bishops hereupon to be represented as a Court of Inquisition, and to be used as the Primitive Persecutors treated the then Churchmen, to be dressed up in the Shape of Lions and Wolves, and to be exposed and baited as an Amusement to the Populace?

But notwithstanding the various Projects of our Constitution-menders, I hope that every good Subject will think, that our Constitution is worth preserving in the Manner it now stands, and that no Alteration therein ought to be at-

tempted. But who are likely to desire it? no Friends to the Church of *England* can: Would they betray the Rights which the Laws of the Land has given them? Do they not consider, that though an Equality of Power be at first only contended for, it must naturally lead to a Superiority somewhere, or to the producing a continual Struggle? Should the Friends to Liberty, as they are called, become Superior, of whatever Sect or Denomination they are, Have those of the Church of *England* any Reason to expect the same kind Treatment as they now show to others? *Ex pede Hercules*; from one Instance you may see of what a persecuting Spirit these Pretenders to Liberty are.

The admitting into Holy Orders, the ordaining of Priests and Deacons, is a religious Matter; Conscience is therein greatly concerned, and they must lay Hands suddenly on no Man. Though the Author of the Letter contends, that in all religious Matters they ought to judge for themselves, without being subject to Penalties or Inconveniencies, yet if upon the Crown's Nomination, almost the whole Bench of Bishops (for the Case necessarily implies that there are not a sufficient Number left to do it) should decline to consecrate the Person appointed, and humbly remonstrate to his Majesty that they could not in Conscience act therein, What is then to be done! They are to be called a Cabal of Bishops, and one of the most Penal Laws is to be put in the most severe Manner in Execution against them, and they are to be subjected to a *Premunire*, by 25 H. 8. l. 5. That is, they shall be put out of the King's Protection, shall forfeit their Lands, Goods, and Chattels, and be imprisoned during the King's Pleasure; and "if that be not sufficient, it is left to the Consi-

" deration

“deration of abler Persons to think of a proper
“Cure for so dangerous a Distemper.” What
can there be more severe, unless it be Fire and
Faggot?

Thus we see, upon a Point of Conscience, in
a Matter of Religion, the Bench of Bishops are
to be extirpated, rather than an Indulgence
should be given to their scrupulous Consciences,
and another be nominated. Here then is your
Man of Moderation, who is against all tempo-
ral Penalties in Matters of Religion. “But
you may as well oppose the Rage of the Sea
in a Tempest, as a * * * intoxicated with
Power.

As those of the Church of *England* have
Reason to dread an Alteration, What would
our Fellow Subjects of *North Britain* do?
Would they be willing, though themselves of a
different Perswasion, to see those Laws abro-
gated, which for the Security of the Church of
England were made an essential and fundamental
Part of the Union? Might they not justly be
apprehensive that their own Church Establish-
ment might hereafter, upon any Change of
Opinion, be likewise changed.”

Next then as to the Dissenters, I mean the seri-
ous, reasonable and thinking Part of them; for as
to the hottest of them, we see that many could e-
ven join with the Papists in extolling the dispen-
sing Power, and were ready to further *any Attempts*
for obtaining an *unlimited Toleration*, and may
again possibly assist their old Allies: But as to
the moderate ones, let each Sect of them consi-
der, that although they might hope in Time
to be uppermost, and bring all into their own
Model, (for if they say they don’t desire it, had
they Power, they cannot be sincere in their re-
ligious Principles) yet if they should fail, and
some

some other Sect outstrip them, are they sure
 they shall be so well used as at present by the
 Church of *England*? They are sensible of the
 Effects of an unlimited Toleration; Where then
 would they have the Bounds fixed? only to ex-
 clude the Papists? Are they willing to give up
 our Saviour's Divinity, and to have all Errors
 in Faith propagated? Where there is so great a
 Latitude, can't the Papists easier turn themselves
 into different Shapes, so as to crowd in unob-
 served, and increase our Divisions? Or what
 Space is it to be restrained to? Is this general
 and unlimited Toleration to be extended to
North Britain? Are they sure of their Appro-
 bation? Let them then consider what Hazards
 may ensue, and how easy they may be at present:
 Has not the Church of *England* always enjoyed
 their present Privileges, in the same Extent?
 Why should they be dispossessed? Have not
 they themselves the same Liberty, the same
 Rights, as they had at his Majesty's happy Ac-
 cession to the Crown, or indeed at any Time
 since the Revolution? And are they not great-
 er than they ever before enjoyed from the earliest
 Ages of the Church and State? Were they not
 after his late Majesty's Accession to the Crown, re-
 stored to a Capacity of obtaining Places of Profit
 and Preferments, even by an Occasional Confor-
 mity, and to the Privilege of educating their
 Children as they pleased? Both which they had
 been deprived of at the latter End of Queen
Anne's Reign; and was not this the utmost of
 their Wishes? Are new Rights then to be cre-
 ated, new Liberties erected, only to gratify
 them? What is their great Merit to deserve it,
 or the Church's Demerit to forfeit theirs? As
 all they at first desired was the Liberty of
 serving God in their own Way, that they enjoy
 without

without Molestation : The Toleration is inviolably observed, and as good Subjects they have his Majesty's Protection and Indulgence ; as good Men they are esteemed and valued, and can reasonably desire no more.

Let us next inquire as to those (too many I fear in Number) who are perfectly indifferent as to Religious Matters, and to all Church Government ; whose Religion sits easy upon them, and if they have any Appearance of it, 'tis only as the Dress of their Country, but so that they may continue to enjoy their Profit and their Pleasures, their Estates and their Liberties, though some Sort of Ecclesiastical Government they must expect, care not (to express my self more suitable to their Ideas) whether the Lawn Sleeves, the Black Cloak, or the Starch'd Cravat, have the sole Direction of all Spiritual Affairs: Would they sit more easy upon a Stool of Repentance, than under the Discipline of the Church of *England* ? How unreasonable must they think it, to be disturbed with such Contentions as these ? But that they should be in Danger of losing all they value, and the common Enemy to Liberty and Property, as well as to our Religion, through these Struggles for Superiority, wherein they don't look upon themselves concerned, should be let in, must be to them provoking : 'Tis apparently therefore their Interest, that no Alterations should be attempted ; but that those who are, and have always been in Possession, should keep it quietly.

Thus of the whole Nation it can turn to account to none but the Papists and those Enemies to our Government who may find their Advantage in Fishing in troubled Waters : For it is certain that *Rome* or the Pretender can have no hopes of ever obtaining a Footing here, but through

through our own Divisions and Uneasiness; and these can arise but from two Causes, from Apprehensions either as to our Civil or Religious Rights: And the Author of the Letter observes, that nothing can alienate the Affections of the People from the Interests of the present Royal Family, as long as their Civil and Religious Rights are preserved.

Strong Attempts have been made to raise Disturbances, under a Pretence that our Civil Liberties were in Danger: But what is a convincing Proof that the Nation in general are fully satisfied with his Majesty's Goodness, and the tender Care he has of the Liberties of his Subjects; and that it is impossible by any direct Means to create a Diffidence in the People, or a Dislike towards the present Royal Family upon that Head, is; that when we saw the Nation half intoxicated with the Fumes of Wine and Tobacco, no sooner did that illustrious Prince of the House of *Orange* appear here, but the People with an artless undissembled Joy, universally flocked to see one, who was not only so justly renowned for his Princely Qualities, but so dear to them as a Relation of our Great Deliverer, from whom we enjoy our present Happiness: They strove without Distinction of Party, which should show the most sincere Marks of a just Veneration for him, and express the heartiest Congratulations of those happy Nuptials, whereby one of the most beautiful and of the most accomplished Princesses in *Europe* was given to his Arms, as a just and grateful Return for the Kindness the Royal Family had received from the Great *Nassau*. Mortifying Sight to those who hate his Memory!

As therefore they must find how vain it is to make an Attack upon that Part of the Constitution,

stitution, supplied with Commanders of that Skill and Fortitude, and whose Hands are strengthened for its Defence ; it is natural to think that they will turn it against the other, which they hope to find the more defenceless Side ; and tho' sensible of the Courage, the Abilities, the indefatigable Care and Watchfulness of those who guard our Church, yet think to create Divisions among them, and even to disunite the Leaders ; and that, either through Prejudice or Indifference, imagine, that they may not be so readily supported ; and if this can be carried, the other will lye more open to their Attack.

See then the Stratagems which are carried on to create these Divisions, *Et ex uno disce omnia* : They find that the Right Reverend the Prelates of the Church, are not only careful of its Rights and Liberties, and watchful over their Flocks, but are likewise strongly attached to his Majesty's Interest, and have unanimously concurred in supporting his Administration, and unless they can be brought into Disrepute, and a less favourable Inclination towards them can be created, their great Wisdom, Knowledge, and Judgment, profound Learning, Singular Probity and Honour, and Exemplary Piety, cannot but have great Influence over all unprejudiced Persons : To prevent this how are they to be represented ? To those who are very zealous for the Church, as too much favouring, too much inclined towards the Dissenters : To the Dissenters, as Inquisitors, Persecutors, and common Enemies to Liberty : To those in the Opposition, because they frustrate their Designs, they are termed a Dead Weight, and Tools to the Ministry : These I think are the Words of the Letter, and 'tis wonderful the learned Tem-

plar could not find out a *Premunire* for such a Cabal of Bishops in this Point also ; To those who join in the Support of his Majesty's Administration, they are to be rendered contemptible for acting, for voting, for uniting in the same Measures with themselves, as acting upon selfish Views ; Vile Calumnies ! How many Symptoms of that unhappy Temper, that once brought these Realms into Confusion !

No longer let these subtle Arts of *Rome* prevail, by sowing Dissention amongst us to weaken the Hands of the Government.

What could then the Intentions of that Letter be ? Was it to direct the Royal Choice ? That were too presuming : Was it by an insolent Appeal to the People, to influence them, and to create Apprehensions in them, that their Religious Liberties were in Danger, and to irritate those, who although they dissent from the Church, are yet quiet and pleased with the Government ? That were highly criminal : And yet what mean these Expressions ? " The World then is the Judge of the Merits of the Cause. — And again, " If such a Recommendation be not proper or sufficient. — Farewell Learning, Farewell Merit, and let *Flattery* and *Slavery*, and *implicit Submission*, and *arbitrary Imposition* ride in Triumph. To whom was the Recommendation ? Who was to be the Judge whether it were proper or sufficient ? I shall spare the Reflection, but can't help observing, That " where such Variety of false Colourings are invented", though the Defence of the Doctor be the Pretence, " such a Scene could not have been acted unless it were to conceal some Truths which it might not be so proper as yet to reveal,

Hjs

His Application to that Right Honourable Person, whose vast Abilities are acknowledged and admired by all, is really surprizing; "He is not to be moved by such little Arts as these"; Flattery is lost upon him, for it cannot reach his Merit: His Candour and Goodness is such, that he will not be induced to believe that any thing was intended in Opposition to him; he will think that it proceeded from a faithful Heart, and sincere Principles; and were it his Friends Cause, were it his own Cause, he will still unite with those who are in his Majesty's Interest, will still join in supporting our Constitution, and in the Defence of true Liberty, as it is bounded and circumscribed by Law, and act, as he has always done, with the utmost Honour.

And you, great Sir, who have drawn these Reflections upon you, by your Fidelity to his Majesty, and your Care for our Religion, go on and prosper in your good Designs, in maintaining the Doctrine, the Worship, the Discipline, and the Government of the Church of *England* as by Law established, and the best Wishes of all its true Friends attend you. Nor can any one wish it more, than,

Cambridge,
13 Jan. 1733.

Sir,

Your most faithful

and most humble

Servant,

P. S. We are to expect, it seems, a second Letter from this Author, upon the Policy of the Opposition given to Dr. R—

W^e

We have always here been Taught, that a strict Regard to our Duty and Conscience, is the best Policy; but it may possibly in human Policy prove sometimes otherwise: If our Great Prelate has erred in that, it redounds the more to his Honour, as it shows he has no temporal Interest, no private Views to serve, but acts for the Good of Religion only, if that be an Error in Policy, *Si non errasset fecerat ille minus*



F I N I S.

